

REMARKS

Claims 13, 31 and 37-39 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Claims 1-12 and 14-30, 32-36 and 40-48 remain pending, with claims 1, 18, 33, 34 and 48 having been amended. Claims 1 and 48 are independent claims. Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

I. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicant appreciates and acknowledges the Examiner's consideration of the October 31, 2005 Information Disclosure Statement.

II. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant appreciates and acknowledges the Examiner's indication of the allowable subject matter set forth in claims 2-47.

III. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,178,271 ("Maas"). Applicant has amended claims 1 and 48 to include subject matter somewhat similar to that previously set forth in claim 13. Because claim 13 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, claims 1 and 48 are in condition for allowance. Allowance of claims independent claims 1 and 48, and all claims depending therefrom, is requested.

IV. COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

On pages 4 and 5 of the December 27, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner offers reasons why claims 2-47 of the present application are allowable over the prior art of record. Although Applicant agrees that these various claimed limitations mentioned in claims 2-47 are not taught or suggested by the prior art taken either singly or in combination, Applicant wishes to emphasize that it is the language of each claim, including the interrelationships and interconnections between various claimed elements which is allowable over the prior art of record, and not the Examiner's paraphrasing of claim features which are present in some allowed claims, but not in others.

For example, on page 3 of the December 27, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner submits that claims 2-6 and 8 are allowable because:

none of the prior art teach singularly or in combination the raw magnetic resonance data filtered using a second filter, separate from a first filter used in first filtering the raw magnetic resonance data before the Fourier transformation, used in forming the second magnetic resonance signal, the raw magnetic resonance data are filtered after demodulation, the raw magnetic resonance data are obtained using a magnetic resonance spectroscopy unit, the raw magnetic resonance data are obtained using a magnetic resonance tomography unit, the filtering is done using a low pass filter and a high pass filter. December 27, 2005 Office Action, pp. 3.

However, of claims 2-6 and 8, only claim 3 recites "the raw magnetic resonance data are filtered after demodulation." Therefore, only the patentability of claim 3, and those claims dependent therefrom, depends upon

this feature, but not the patentability of claim 2, for example. Similar comments apply to other allowed claims.

V. CONCLUSION

In view of above remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Andrew M. Waxman, Reg. No. 56,007, at the number of the undersigned listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC

By 
Donald J. Daley
Reg. No. 34,313

DJD/AMW:jcp

AM

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000